

Serial Number: 09/783,803

Docket Number: 10004310-1

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1-18 remain pending in the present patent application. Applicant requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

In item 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0116620 A1 filed by Gimbert (hereafter "Gimbert"). A prima facie case of obviousness is established only when the prior art teaches or suggests all of the elements of the claims. MPEP §2143.03, In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 U.S.P.Q2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). For the reasons that follow, Applicant asserts that Gimbert fails to show or suggest each of the elements of claims 1-18 as originally filed. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1-18 be withdrawn.

To begin, claim 1 provides as follows:

1. A method in for transferring a digital document, comprising the steps of:
  - mapping from a number of destination addresses to a respective number of security identifiers via a directory server;
  - adding a number of access privileges to the digital document in a computer system via a network using the security identifiers; and
  - posting the digital document on a server accessible via the network.

Applicant notes that claim 6, 11, and 15 also include elements similar in scope with that of claim 1 above. With respect to claims 1, 6, 11, and 15, the Office Actions states:

"Gimbert teaches a method in for transferring a digital document, comprising the steps of:

- a. mapping from a number of destination addresses to a respective number of security identifiers via a director server (Gimbert: see for example, paragraph [0016] line 10-120);..." (Office Action, page 2).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Gimbert fails to show or suggest mapping a number of destination addresses to a respective number of security identifiers in a directory server of a network. Specifically, at paragraph [0016] inclusive of the cited portion above in the Office Action above, Gimbert states:

"The web server 16 may contain various parts in its preferred embodiment. The web server 16 may utilize an automatic electronic mail program 22 to notify designated users concerning

Serial Number: 09/783,803

Docket Number: 10004310-1

the modification of the status of a document within the database 28. A modification of the documents' status, such as approval of a document, rejection of a document, modification of a document's content or location, etc could trigger an electronic mail notification to users associated with the document and may contain a hypertext link to the document that was modified. The web server may allow access to various functions of the system according to username or by any other means to identify the user known in the art. The web server can use any security system known in the art, such as a Lightweight Directors Access Protocol (LDAP) directory on the web server 16. ***The security system 24 on the web server 16 correlates the identity of the user entered with a list within the system's directory.*** The identity of the user must exist in the systems' directory before the security system will allow access to the system. As well, in an embodiment of the present invention, the web server 16 may contain a series of web pages 26 containing information on products, services, and information concerning past compliance with agency regulations. The web server 16 could also connect to and communicate with a database 28 that contains information products and services of the entity." (Emphasis Added)

In this respect, the web server of Gimbert employs, for example, a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) directory in the web server. The security system on the web server correlates an entered identity of a user with a list within the system's directory to determine whether a user is to have access to documents stored thereon. However, the identity of the user that is mapped to security information is not a destination address on a particular network. Rather, Gimbert teaches that a user must log onto a system with a username and password as is described with reference to box 38 of FIG. 2 of Gimbert. At other portions, Gimbert further describes this particular approach. For example, in paragraph 15, Gimbert states:

"The employees of both the entity and the regulatory agency have the web address or universal resource locator (URL) of the web server 16 and an authorized user identity to access the system. Without both the address and the authorized user identity the firewall 10 will not allow unauthorized users to use the system."

Also, in paragraph [0021] Gimbert states:

"The user must be identified by a web security system, such as a user name and password, to access the system at step 38. The web security system correlates the identity of the user with the list of authorized users within the directory and, if the user is authorized, the user can enter the site. A password in conjunction with the user name provides added assurance that the user is the individual corresponding to the user name."

Serial Number: 09/783,803

Docket Number: 10004310-1

In addition, in paragraph [0022], [0023], and [0024], Gimbert further describes that users must enter the system by logging in at step 38 by entering their username and password. Nowhere does Gimbert show or suggest the concept of mapping a number of destination addresses to a respective number of security identifiers via a directory server as set forth in claims 1, 6, 11, and 15. This reflects the fact that a user enters the destination email addresses when digitally sending a document that is scanned by a digital sender device as set forth in the instant specification.

Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the rejection of claims 1, 6, 11, and 15 is improper. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1, 6, 11, and 15 be withdrawn. In addition, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-14, and 16-18 be withdrawn as depending from claims 1, 6, 11, or 15, respectively.

In addition, claim 3 as originally filed states as follows:

3. The method of claim 1, wherein the step of mapping from the number of destination addresses to the respective number of security identifiers via the directory server further comprises the step of transmitting each of the destination addresses to the directory server along with a request for the security identifier associated therewith.

Applicant notes that claims 8, 13, and 17 incorporate subject matter similar in scope with that of claim 3 above. With respect to claims 3, 8, 13, and 17, the Office Action states:

"Gimbert as modified teaches the claimed invention as described above (see claim 1, 6, 11, and 15 respectively). Gimbert as modified further teaches mapping from the number of destination addresses to the respective number of security identifiers via the directory server further comprises the step of transmitting each of the destination addresses to the directory server along with the request for the security identifier associated therewith (Gimbert: see for example, paragraph [0016] line 14-20)." (Office Action, page 4)

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, if Gimbert does not teach mapping destination addresses to security identifiers as is described above, then Applicant asserts that Gimbert fails to show or suggest transmitting each of the destination addresses to the directory server along with a request for the security identifier associated therewith.

Serial Number: 09/783,803Docket Number: 10004310-1

Thus, Applicant asserts that Gimbert fails to show or suggest the subject matter of claims 3, 8, 13, and 17. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 3, 8, 13, and 17 be withdrawn for this additional reason.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicant's response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. D'Aurelio  
Reg. No. 40,977

D'Aurelio & Mathews, LLC  
96 Church Street  
Chagrin Falls, Ohio 44022  
Phone: (440) 729-7450  
Fax: (440) 729-7465